

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREVOR GLENN LANDERS,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. LEWIS, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-02477-JD](#)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH
LEAVE TO AMEND**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

DISCUSSION

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the Court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims which are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *Id.* at 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Although a complaint “does not need detailed factual allegations, . . . a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. . . . Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above

the speculative level.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations omitted). A complaint must proffer “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 570. The United States Supreme Court has explained the “plausible on its face” standard of *Twombly*: “While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

LEGAL CLAIMS

Plaintiff alleges that defendants conspired and were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment and state law. Deliberate indifference to serious medical needs violates the Eighth Amendment’s proscription against cruel and unusual punishment. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976); *McGuckin v. Smith*, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992), *overruled on other grounds*, *WMX Technologies, Inc. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc). A determination of “deliberate indifference” involves an examination of two elements: the seriousness of the prisoner’s medical need and the nature of the defendant’s response to that need. *Id.* at 1059.

A serious medical need exists if the failure to treat a prisoner’s condition could result in further significant injury or the “unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.” *Id.* The existence of an injury that a reasonable doctor or patient would find important and worthy of comment or treatment, the presence of a medical condition that significantly affects an individual’s daily activities, or the existence of chronic and substantial pain are examples of indications that a prisoner has a serious need for medical treatment. *Id.* at 1059-60.

A prison official is deliberately indifferent if he or she knows that a prisoner faces a substantial risk of serious harm and disregards that risk by failing to take reasonable steps to abate it. *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994). The prison official must not only “be aware of

facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists,” but also “must also draw the inference.” *Id.* If a prison official should have been aware of the risk, but did not actually know, the official has not violated the Eighth Amendment, no matter how severe the risk. *Gibson v. County of Washoe*, 290 F.3d 1175, 1188 (9th Cir. 2002). “A difference of opinion between a prisoner-patient and prison medical authorities regarding treatment does not give rise to a § 1983 claim.” *Franklin v. Oregon*, 662 F.2d 1337, 1344 (9th Cir. 1981). In addition, “mere delay of surgery, without more, is insufficient to state a claim of deliberate medical indifference.... [Prisoner] would have no claim for deliberate medical indifference unless the denial was harmful.” *Shapely v. Nevada Bd. Of State Prison Comm’rs*, 766 F.2d 404, 407 (9th Cir. 1985).

A civil conspiracy is a combination of two or more persons who, by some concerted action, intend to accomplish some unlawful objective for the purpose of harming another which result in damage. *Gilbrook v. City of Westminster*, 177 F.3d 839, 856 (9th Cir. 1999). To prove a civil conspiracy, the plaintiff must show that the conspiring parties reached a unity of purpose or common design and understanding, or a meeting of the minds in an unlawful agreement. *Id.* To be liable, each participant in the conspiracy need not know the exact details of the plan, but each participant must at least share the common objective of the conspiracy. *Id.*

Plaintiff states that he suffered a severe shoulder injury prior to being incarcerated. He alleges that surgery was recommended by an outside provider, but the surgery was denied by prison officials. While the denial of surgery can state a constitutional deprivation, plaintiff has not presented sufficient allegations. Plaintiff must describe how the specific defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs by denying the surgery. Plaintiff also states a defendant denied him adequate pain management but fails to provide more information. The complaint is dismissed with leave to amend for plaintiff to describe how the individual defendants violated his constitutional rights. Plaintiff should describe what occurred following the denial of surgery and the denial of pain medication and how this demonstrates deliberate indifference. Plaintiff has also failed to present sufficient allegations to demonstrate a conspiracy. This claim is also dismissed with leave to amend.

CONCLUSION

1. The complaint is **DISMISSED** with leave to amend. The amended complaint must be filed within **twenty-eight (28) days** of the date this order is filed and must include the caption

1 and civil case number used in this order and the words AMENDED COMPLAINT on the first
2 page. Because an amended complaint completely replaces the original complaint, plaintiff must
3 include in it all the claims he wishes to present. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th
4 Cir. 1992). He may not incorporate material from the original complaint by reference. Failure to
5 amend within the designated time will result in the dismissal of this action.

6 2. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the
7 Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper with the clerk headed "Notice
8 of Change of Address," and must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to
9 do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of
10 Civil Procedure 41(b).

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: September 20, 2018

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


JAMES DONATO
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREVOR GLENN LANDERS,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. LEWIS, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-02477-JD](#)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on September 20, 2018, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Trevor Glenn Landers ID: AA-6760
Salinas Valley State Prison
P.O. Box 1050
FDB7-127
Soledad, CA 93960-1050

Dated: September 20, 2018

Susan Y. Soong
Clerk, United States District Court

By: 
LISA R. CLARK, Deputy Clerk to the
Honorable JAMES DONATO